

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION**

<b>In re: BRIDGESTONE/FIRESTONE, INC.,</b>	<b>) Master File No. IP 00-9373-C-B/S</b>
<b>TIRES PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION</b>	<b>) MDL NO. 1373</b>
<hr/>	<b>)</b>
<b>THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO ALL</b>	<b>)</b>
<b>ACTIONS</b>	<b>)</b>

**ENTRY ON FIRESTONE'S MOTION TO COMPEL**

This cause is before the magistrate judge on the motion of defendant Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc. ("Firestone") entitled Motion to Compel Production of Documents by Ford Motor Company in Response to First Set of Requests. In its motion, Firestone seeks an order compelling Ford to produce all documents responsive to the following documents requests: Nos. 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 17, 18, 24, 25, 32-35, 39, 42(2), 43-45, 47, 49-51, 55-58, 60, 76, 77, 85, 86, 93-96, 98, 100, 101, 105-07, 109, 11-15, 117-20, and 122. In addition, Firestone seeks to compel Ford to produce or make available to it the items listed in its Request for Things Nos. II, III, VI, and VII. The magistrate judge has been stymied by the fact that Ford apparently supplemented its responses to the requests at issue on the day Firestone's reply brief was due, and Firestone therefore understandably was unable to assimilate Ford's supplemental response into its reply. Accordingly, the extent of disagreement still remaining between the parties is not entirely clear; it may well be that Ford now has responded adequately to some of the requests listed above. It is also the magistrate judge's hope that further discussions between the parties will render much, if not all, of Firestone's motion moot. Accordingly, the motion is **taken under advisement** to permit Firestone to file a supplemental reply brief, to which Ford may respond within seven days.

To aid the parties in their attempts to resolve any remaining issues, the magistrate judge notes

the following:

1. As the magistrate judge has indicated several times in the past, Ford is required to indicate, by Bates number, which of the documents in its electronic document depository are responsive to each of Firestone's documents requests.
2. To the extent that Ford has not completed its search for responsive documents, it shall do so no later than **December 17, 2001**; as of that date, Ford should be in a position to certify that it has identified all responsive documents in its possession or control.
3. To the extent that Ford believes that a confidentiality agreement between Ford and a third party applies to responsive documents in Ford's possession or control and prohibits Ford from producing those documents, Ford shall file a motion for protective order which specifically lists each such document and specifically references the applicable confidentiality agreement.
4. The magistrate judge expects the parties to make every effort to resolve any objection that a document request is "overly broad" by narrowing the scope of the request and/or defining terms within the request.

ENTERED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of December 2001.

---

V. Sue Shields  
United States Magistrate Judge  
Southern District of Indiana

Copies to:

Irwin B Levin  
Cohen & Malad  
136 North Delaware Street  
P O Box 627  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

William E Winingham  
Wilson Kehoe & Winingham  
2859 North Meridian Street  
P.O. Box 1317  
Indianapolis, IN 46206-1317

Randall Riggs  
Locke Reynolds LLP  
201 N. Illinois St., Suite 1000  
P.O. Box 44961  
Indianapolis, IN 46244-0961